

## CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Julia Moran	Team: Squad #6	CCRB Case #: 202104039	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Thursday, 06/24/2021 1:04 AM	Location of Incident: § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b)	Precinct: 78	18 Mo. SOL 12/24/2022	EO SOL 12/24/2022	
Date/Time CV Reported Wed, 07/07/2021 4:40 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: In-person	Date/Time Received at CCRB Wed, 07/07/2021 4:40 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. Officers			
2. An officer			
3. PO Terryl Richardson	17859	964723	078 PCT
4. SGT Shapiro Le Corps	05255	932886	078 PCT
5. PO Lea Marie Weiss	25766	970312	078 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. POM Michael Matos	23111	969954	078 PCT
2. PO Christopher Colon	13441	969598	078 PCT
3. PO Jonathan Ruiz	08409	963729	078 PCT
4. PO Johnel Taioyyong	26643	970250	078 PCT
5. PO Kyle O'Sullivan	28156	969259	078 PCT
6. PO Adnan Mughal	25962	967216	078 PCT
7. SGT Sherrice Rowland	02533	939379	077 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A. Officers	Abuse: Officers failed to obtain language interpretation services for § 87(2)(b)	
B.SGT Shapiro Le Corps	Abuse: Sergeant Shapiro Le Corps threatened § 87(2)(b) with the use of force.	
C. Officers	Abuse: Officers entered § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn.	
D.PO Terryl Richardson	Force: Police Officer Terryl Richardson used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
E. An officer	Force: An officer used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
F. Officers	Force: Officers used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
G.SGT Shapiro Le Corps	Abuse: Sergeant Shapiro Le Corps forcibly removed § 87(2)(b) to the hospital.	
H.PO Lea Marie Weiss	Abuse: Police Officer Lea Marie Weiss failed to obtain language interpretation services for § 87(2)(b)	

## Case Summary

On July 7, 2021, § 87(2)(b) filed the following complaint in person with the CCRB on behalf of herself and her mother, § 87(2)(b)

On June 24, 2021, at approximately 1:04 a.m., § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were inside their room at the § 87(2)(b) located at § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn when § 87(2)(b) called 911 to report harassment by the shelter staff. Officers and EMS responded to § 87(2)(b) and spoke with § 87(2)(b) in the hallway. § 87(2)(b) began to speak with officers about her daughter and requested a Creole language interpreter, which officers did not provide (**Allegation A: Abuse of Authority** – § 87(2)(g)). While speaking with officers, § 87(2)(b) told officers she did nothing wrong and went back into her room. Sgt. Shapiro Le Corps of the 78<sup>th</sup> Precinct allegedly told § 87(2)(b) that they would remove her by force if she did not exit her room (**Allegation B: Abuse of Authority** – § 87(2)(g)). Officers then entered her room (**Allegation C: Abuse of Authority** – § 87(2)(g)). Once inside the room, PO Terry Richardson of the 78<sup>th</sup> Precinct pushed § 87(2)(b) and an officer allegedly slapped § 87(2)(b) on her mouth with the back of his hand (**Allegation D: Force** – § 87(2)(g)). **Allegation E: Force** – § 87(2)(g). Officers then pushed § 87(2)(b) onto her knees and handcuffed her (**Allegation F: Force** – § 87(2)(g)).

§ 87(2)(b) was removed to § 87(2)(b) Hospital for a psychiatric evaluation (**Allegation G: Abuse of Authority** – § 87(2)(g)). While at the hospital, § 87(2)(b) requested a Creole interpreter from PO Lea Marie Weiss of the 78<sup>th</sup> Precinct, which was not provided (**Allegation H: Abuse of Authority** – § 87(2)(g)).

No arrests were made or summons issued in regards to this incident.

Ten BWC videos were received in regards to this incident (BR 01 – 10).

## Findings and Recommendations

### **Allegation (A) Abuse of Authority: Officers failed to obtain language interpretation services for § 87(2)(b)**

At the 16:50 mark of PO O’Sullivan’s BWC, EMS informed § 87(2)(b) that they needed to transport her to the hospital. § 87(2)(b) refused, and EMS responded that this was not the first time and based on what the staff had told them that § 87(2)(b) lit fires, they had to take her to the hospital. § 87(2)(b) refused again. At the 18:34 mark, § 87(2)(b) told officers that, “my mom is not speaking English because they [unknown who this is in referring to] want me, they want my brain to make surgery.” At the 19:22 mark, § 87(2)(b) again said her mom does not speak English and § 87(2)(b) stated she did not speak English. No officer was speaking to § 87(2)(b) during this time. At the 21:41 mark, Sgt. Le Corps asked § 87(2)(b) if she wanted to speak with the officers downstairs and § 87(2)(b) refused to speak with officers outside. § 87(2)(b) then stated that she was the officers’ problem, not her mother, and that § 87(2)(b) spoke on behalf of her mother. EMS responded that § 87(2)(b) was fine, and they only wanted to take § 87(2)(b) to the hospital. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) then both stated § 87(2)(b) did not speak English. At no point did § 87(2)(b) or § 87(2)(b) request an interpreter or did officers speak with § 87(2)(b) (BR 06).

§ 87(2)(b) testified that after she burned sage in her room, officers and EMS arrived at the room she and her daughter share at the shelter. EMS told § 87(2)(b) that they needed to evaluate her. § 87(2)(b) asked the officers for a Creole interpreter and officers responded that § 87(2)(b) could interpret for her. § 87(2)(b) responded that § 87(2)(b) could not speak for her, and she would prefer an interpreter. The officers told § 87(2)(b) that they only needed to speak with § 87(2)(b). No officer requested an interpreter (BR 11).

§ 87(2)(b) testified that on June 24, 2021, she and her mother went to speak with officers outside their room in the hallway. Officers told § 87(2)(b) that a staff member informed the officers that § 87(2)(b) was violent and agitated, which § 87(2)(b) denied. § 87(2)(b) then told officers that she was the one who burnt incense, and not her daughter, § 87(2)(b). One of the officers responded that they were only there for her daughter, § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) then told officers she spoke Creole and requested a Creole language interpreter so she could understand what § 87(2)(b) did wrong. § 87(2)(b) speaks Haitian Creole and has limited proficiency in English. § 87(2)(b) speaks Haitian Creole and is proficient in English. Officers did not obtain an interpreter for § 87(2)(b) (BR 12).

Officer interviews were not conducted as they would not have changed the disposition of the allegations.

When determining whether or not the person requires language assistance services, the member of service must consider both the nature and importance of the police services being provided in addition to the person's apparent capacity to comprehend and communicate Patrol Guide 212-90 (BR 13).

While both § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) testified that § 87(2)(b) asked officers for an interpreter so she could understand what the officers' needed § 87(2)(b) for, PO O'Sullivan's BWC showed that neither civilian requested an interpreter for § 87(2)(b) at any time. Although civilian testimony and officer BWC showed that § 87(2)(b) told officers she did not speak English, PO O'Sullivan's BWC showed that no officer tried to speak with § 87(2)(b) and that officers repeatedly told § 87(2)(b) they only needed to speak with § 87(2)(b) about being brought to the hospital and that they had no concerns about § 87(2)(b). The Patrol Guide states that members of service must determine whether the nature and importance of police services being provided require officers to obtain an interpreter. § 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

**Allegation (B) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Shapiro Le Corps threatened § 87(2)(b) with the use of force.**

**Allegation (C) Abuse of Authority: Officers entered § 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn.**

**Allegation (G) Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Shapiro Le Corps forcibly removed § 87(2)(b).**

§ 87(2)(b) to the hospital.

At the 2:20 mark of Sgt. Le Corps' BWC, § 87(2)(b) told officers she put lit incense by the fire alarm to make officers respond to her. At the 3:15 mark, Sgt. Le Corps radioed for an ambulance for a non-violent EDP. At the 3:45 mark, § 87(2)(b) told officers that there was something hard under her stomach that told her that it had slept with her every night. Sgt. Le Corps informed § 87(2)(b) at the 5:10 mark, that he called EMS and they would speak with her. § 87(2)(b) asked why EMS was coming and Sgt. Le Corps explained that EMS would evaluate her and if nothing was wrong then the officers would leave. EMS arrived at 12:59 minutes and § 87(2)(b) told EMS that she felt something under her bed and stomach. At the 16:15 mark, EMS told § 87(2)(b) that they need to transport her to the closest hospital. When § 87(2)(b) asked why, EMS responded that this was not the first time this has happened and based on what the staff has told them about starting fires, § 87(2)(b) had to be taken to the hospital. At the 21:10 mark, Sgt. Le Corps asked § 87(2)(b) if she wanted to go downstairs with the officers. § 87(2)(b) refused. At the 24:54 mark, Sgt. Le Corps told § 87(2)(b) that she had to go to the hospital because EMS evaluated her and deemed a removal necessary. He went on to tell her that she could come on her own or officers could put handcuffs on her and take her. § 87(2)(b) went back into her room to call a witness and asked what she did to be handcuffed. § 87(2)(b) then returned to the hallway. Sgt. Le Corps responded that she needed to be evaluated and she refused to go. At the 26:12 mark, EMS again told § 87(2)(b) that she needed to go to the hospital. § 87(2)(b) exited the hallway and returned to her room. Officers entered § 87(2)(b)'s room at the 26:31 mark (BR 07).

PO Ruiz's BWC captured the same time frame from a different position. At the 18:10 mark, a male EMS in a blue shirt, who told § 87(2)(b) that she needed to go to the hospital, spoke with a Black female staff member in a white shirt. The male EMS asked if § 87(2)(b) had a psychiatric history. The staff member's response cannot be heard. The EMT then asked if this has happened before, and the staff member nodded her head in the affirmative. The male EMS told the staff member that they can transport § 87(2)(b) to the hospital (BR 04).

§ 87(2)(b) testified that on June 24, 2021, her mother, § 87(2)(b) was burning sage incense in their room at the § 87(2)(b) when a staff member smelled the incense and accused the § 87(2)(b) of setting their room on fire. § 87(2)(b) called 911 to report that the staff member was harassing them. Officers and EMS arrived on scene and the § 87(2)(b) met them in the hallway. Officers informed § 87(2)(b) that they were responding to a call about a fire. § 87(2)(b) responded that there was no fire. The officers then informed her that a staff member called 911 to report that § 87(2)(b) was a violent and agitated person, which § 87(2)(b) denied. Officers asked § 87(2)(b) to follow them outside but she refused and went back into her room. Sgt. Le Corps then told § 87(2)(b) "If you don't come out, we will take you by force." All the officers then entered the § 87(2)(b)'s room. Neither § 87(2)(b) nor § 87(2)(b) gave permission for officers to enter.

§ 87(2)(b) testified that on June 24, 2021, she burnt sage in the room she shares with her daughter to help keep bad spirits and werewolves away so she could sleep. Another resident in the shelter called 911 and stated there was a violent individual living in the shelter. Officers and EMS arrived on scene and EMS informed § 87(2)(b) that they had to evaluate her. An EMT informed the § 87(2)(b) that the shelter had called stating there was a violent and agitated person in the shelter. § 87(2)(b) stated she was not violent. An officer responded that they saw that she was not violent, but they needed her to be evaluated

anyway. Multiple officers then reiterated that § 87(2)(b) had to be evaluated. Officers asked § 87(2)(b) to go downstairs to speak with them. § 87(2)(b) asked why § 87(2)(b) needed to go downstairs when she § 87(2)(b) had been the one to burn sage. Multiple officers just reiterated that § 87(2)(b) had to go downstairs and if she refused, they would take her by force. § 87(2)(b) denied doing anything wrong and asked the officers why they were trying to create problems for her. § 87(2)(b) continued to tell officers that someone was using her social security number and the officers needed to investigate what was happening. § 87(2)(b) refused to go downstairs and went back inside her room. Officers immediately followed and entered the room. Neither § 87(2)(b) nor § 87(2)(b) gave permission for officers to enter.

The 911 call was obtained and confirmed the shelter shift supervisor, § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) called from the shelter for a client who was threatening to start fires and the fire alarm was going off and there was smoke on the first floor. § 87(2)(b) stated the other clients were in danger. The operator clarified that the client was intentionally starting the fires. § 87(2)(b) told the operator that the client has a mental health history and needed to be 'EDPed.' § 87(2)(b) stated that this was not the first incident they have had with the client, but this was the first incident that has put other clients in danger (BR 14).

A NYC Department of Homeless Services Incident Report was prepared regarding this incident. The report marked the incident as a psychiatric incident resulting in transportation to the hospital. § 87(2)(b) noted that on June 24, 2021, at approximately 12:36 a.m., the fire control panel sounded indicating there was a signal coming from unit 103. The resident aide went to investigate possible issues. It was found that clients in unit 103 § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were burning incents in unit. S/S § 87(2)(b) requested clients to exit smoked filled unit; client refused and stated to call the police. Clients were extremely uncooperative and stating things that made no sense. Clients were asked why they were lighting incents and the client stated to police officers that they were signaling the police so the police would know their whereabouts. Due to the fact of client's behavior, it was decided by EMS, FDNY, NYPD, and staff to EDP client to assess client's mental health (BR 15).

An Emotionally Disturbed Person (EDP) is a person who appears to be mentally ill or temporarily deranged and is conducting himself in a manner which a police officer reasonable believes is likely to result in serious injury to himself or others Patrol Guide Procedure 221-13 (BR 16). Under the emergency doctrine, officers may conduct a warrantless entry to prevent loss of life or property. For this exception to apply, the police must have reasonable grounds to believe that an emergency is at hand and an immediate need for their assistance for the protection of life or property. The search must not be primarily motivated by an intent to arrest, and there must be some reasonable basis, approximating probable cause, to associate the emergency with the area or place to be searched. People v. Doll, 21 N.Y.3d 665, (2013) (BR 17).

BWC confirmed that § 87(2)(b) purposely lit incense to set off the smoke alarms to get officers to respond. Officer BWC showed that Sgt. Le Corps informed § 87(2)(b) multiple times that she needed to be evaluated by EMS so they could determine if she needed to be removed to the hospital. BWC showed, and shelter documentation confirmed, that EMS arrived on scene and conferred with shelter staff and § 87(2)(b) about if she needed to be removed to the hospital before ultimately deciding that she had to be removed for psychiatric evaluation. The BWC showed that EMS made the decision to remove her to the hospital for a psychiatric evaluation and officers acted after EMS made the decision. Once the decision to remove § 87(2)(b) was made, both EMS and several officers told § 87(2)(b)

repeatedly that she had to go to the hospital. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) testified, and BWC corroborated, that § 87(2)(b) refused both verbally and physically to leave with officers. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) both alleged that after § 87(2)(b) refused to go downstairs, Sgt. Le Corps threatened § 87(2)(b) with the use of force. However, Sgt. Le Corps' BWC showed that when § 87(2)(b) refused to leave with officers, Sgt. Le Corps told her she could come on her own or the officers could place her in handcuffs to take her. At no point did Sgt. Le Corps threaten § 87(2)(b) with the use of force.

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

**Allegation (D) Force: Police Officer Terryl Richardson used physical force against**

§ 87(2)(b)

**Allegation (E) Force: An officer used physical force against** § 87(2)(b)

**Allegation (F) Force: Officers used physical force against** § 87(2)(b)

At the 27:35 mark of PO Richardson's BWC, § 87(2)(b) stood between officers and § 87(2)(b) in the hallway inside their room. Officers told § 87(2)(b) she had to leave, and she refused. § 87(2)(b) repeatedly said to officers, "no." PO Richardson held § 87(2)(b)'s right forearm with his left hand and told her to stand back and moved her out of the entry way and to the side of the room. PO Richardson then kept his left hand on § 87(2)(b)'s arm and told her to stand right there [side of the room] and not move (BR 01).

At the 26:54 mark of Sgt. Le Corps' BWC, while § 87(2)(b) was sitting on a bed, PO Mughal told § 87(2)(b) that she had to go to the hospital, which she refused to do. PO Ruiz then asked § 87(2)(b) to come downstairs and speak with the officers and she responded that she needed to make a phone call. Officers told her she could not, and § 87(2)(b) reiterated she needed to make a call. PO O'Sullivan again explained that § 87(2)(b) had to go to the hospital. § 87(2)(b) continued to ask officers why she had to be removed and they explained that EMS deemed that she needed an evaluation. At the 27:54 mark, Sgt. Le Corps told PO Mughal, PO Ruiz, PO Matos, and PO O'Sullivan to handcuff § 87(2)(b). PO Mughal and PO O'Sullivan grabbed § 87(2)(b) by her arms and lifted her off the bed so that she was standing up. Sgt. Le Corps then put his hand on § 87(2)(b)'s back and turned her around. Officers then pushed § 87(2)(b) on her back and down onto the bed she was sitting on, so she was on her stomach. Sgt. Le Corps pushed her left shoulder down and PO O'Sullivan and PO Mughal grabbed § 87(2)(b)'s right arm. Sgt. Le Corps then grabbed § 87(2)(b)'s right shoulder and turned her body, so she was on her left side while officers continued to handcuff § 87(2)(b). At no point did any officer slap § 87(2)(b) in the face.

PO Matos' BWC offers a different angle of the same timeframe. At the 28:45 mark, PO Mughal tried to grab § 87(2)(b)'s right arm while PO O'Sullivan tried to grab her left arm, which held her phone. At no point did any officer slap § 87(2)(b) in the face. § 87(2)(b) moved her body away from officers and repeatedly told them to let her go. PO Matos then grabbed her right wrist and arm while § 87(2)(b) continued to move her body away from officers. § 87(2)(b) then stood up and PO Mughal, PO O'Sullivan, and Sgt. Le Corps turned § 87(2)(b) around and pushed her onto the bed so that her back was towards the officers. Officers then handcuffed § 87(2)(b) and brought her outside (BR 03).

PO O'Sullivan's BWC offered a different angle of the same timeframe. At the 27:23 mark, PO Mughal told § 87(2)(b) that she had to go to the hospital. § 87(2)(b) refused. At the 28:20 mark, PO O'Sullivan told § 87(2)(b) that she needed to go to the hospital to get checked out. § 87(2)(b) responded that she needs to call her aunt and refused to go. PO Mughal then grabbed § 87(2)(b) on her right arm. PO O'Sullivan grabbed § 87(2)(b)'s left arm, in which she was holding her phone, and held her wrist. At no point did any officer slap § 87(2)(b).

§ 87(2)(b) testified that upon officers entering her room, an officer pushed § 87(2)(b). An officer then slapped § 87(2)(b) on her mouth with the back of his hand. Multiple officers then surrounded § 87(2)(b) and pushed her onto her knees and placed handcuffs on her. § 87(2)(b) did not cooperate when officers were trying to handcuff her because she did not know why she was being arrested.

§ 87(2)(b) testified that once officers were inside the room, an officer pushed § 87(2)(b) onto the bed and then onto the floor, so she had her knees on the ground. The officers then put pressure on § 87(2)(b)'s shoulder. An officer then took § 87(2)(b)'s phone out of her hand and slapped her on the face. § 87(2)(b) was then handcuffed. § 87(2)(b) did not physically resist while officers handcuffed her. While officers were trying to handcuff § 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(b) tried to cover § 87(2)(b) and block the police from trying to touch her, so PO Richardson pushed her out of the way.

TRI #§ 87(2)(b) was prepared by Sgt. Le Corps for ICAD § 87(2)(b) and noted the type of force used by members of service was wrestling/grappling and listed the members of service involved as PO O'Sullivan, PO Mughal, PO Matos, PO Ruiz, and Sgt. Le Corps. The TRI noted that § 87(2)(b) became non-compliant and aggressive and refused to be removed to the hospital (BR 18).

Force may be used when it is reasonable to ensure the safety of a member of the service or a third person, or otherwise protect life, or when it is reasonable to place a person in custody or to prevent escape from custody. Force may be used when a member of service must gain compliance, control, or custody of an uncooperative subject Patrol Guide 221-02 (BR 19).

§ 87(2)(b) testified, and BWC confirmed, that when officers were trying to handcuff and remove § 87(2)(b) from her room, § 87(2)(b) tried to physically intervene and prevent the officers from handcuffing § 87(2)(b). Once § 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) both alleged that upon officers entering their room, and before officers handcuffed § 87(2)(b) an officer slapped § 87(2)(b) on the face. However, BWC showed that once officers were inside the room, PO O'Sullivan, PO Mughal, and PO Ruiz told § 87(2)(b) multiple times that they needed to remove her to the hospital. At no point did any officer make physical contact with § 87(2)(b) before they grabbed her arms to handcuff her. Sgt. Le Corps, PO Matos, and PO O'Sullivan's BWCs showed that no officer ever slapped § 87(2)(b) on the face or made contact with her face.

BWC showed that when the officers informed § 87(2)(b) that she needed to be brought to the hospital, she refused to comply with the officers' commands to leave with them. § 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b)

**Allegation (H) Abuse of Authority: Officers failed to obtain language interpretation services for § 87(2)(b)**

None of the officers' BWC was activated while § 87(2)(b) was inside the hospital.

§ 87(2)(b) testified that when she and § 87(2)(b) arrived at the hospital, § 87(2)(b) refused to speak English and told PO Weiss that she needed a Creole interpreter. PO Weiss and two nurses, including a Creole speaking nurse, told § 87(2)(b) that she had to speak English. A female hospital employee who spoke Creole then spoke with § 87(2)(b) to determine what happened. § 87(2)(b) stated no interpreter was ever provided for § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) never alleged she requested a Creole interpreter.

§ 87(2)(b)'s medical records were obtained and noted that her language of preference oral/written as English. The medical records did note that although § 87(2)(b) stated she only spoke Creole, she spoke in English during triage (BR).

Members of service must provide interpretation/translation services for members of the public in the field and at Department facilities. When determining whether or not the person requires language assistance services, the member of service must consider both the nature and importance of the police services being provided in addition to the person's apparent capacity to comprehend and communicate Patrol Guide 212-90 (BR 20).

§ 87(2)(b) testified that when § 87(2)(b) was at the hospital, she requested an interpreter from PO Weiss and no interpreter was acquired, but a hospital staff member who spoke Creole spoke with § 87(2)(b) about what happened. Although § 87(2)(b) never alleged that she requested any interpretation services, medical records



noted that she stated she only spoke Creole while speaking English. § 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

### Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- § 87(2)(b)
- § 87(2)(b)
- Sgt. Le Corps has been a member of service for 18 years and has been a subject in six CCRB complaints and nine allegations, of which two were substantiated (BR 23).:
  - 200718094 involved unsubstantiated allegations of threat of force and discourteous word.
  - 200803950 involved substantiated allegations of gun pointed and search of person against Sgt. Le Corps. The Board recommended Charges and the NYPD did not impose disciplinary action.
  - 201500041 involved an allegation of nonlethal restraining device and was administratively closed.
  - § 87(2)(b)
  - § 87(2)(b)
  - § 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)
- PO Richardson has been a member of service for four years and has been a subject in one other CCRB complaint and one allegation, which was not substantiated. § 87(2)(g)
- PO Weiss has been a member-of-service for one year and this is the first CCRB complaint to which she has been a subject (BR 25).

### Mediation, Civil, and Criminal Histories

- This complaint was not suitable for mediation due to the mediation moratorium.
- As of May 18, 2022, the New York City Office of the Comptroller has no record of a Notice of Claim being filed in regards to this incident (BR 26).
- § 87(2)(b)
- § 87(2)(b)

Squad: 6

Investigator:	Julia Moran	Inv. Julia Moran	06/21/2022
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

CCRB Case # 202104039

Squad Leader: Jessica Peña IM Jessica Peña 10/28/2022  
Signature Print Title & Name Date